1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 6 AT TACOMA 7 8 MICHAEL LATOURETTE, CASE NO. C12-564 BHS 9 Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING 10 v. DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO ARGUE DEFENSE 11 WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF OF QUALIFIED IMMUNITY CORRECTIONS, et al., 12 Defendants. 13 14 This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Clallam Bay Corrections 15 Center, Joseph Daracunas, Ron Fraker, Amber Miller, Richardson, Riddle, Eldon Vail, 16 Bernie Warner, and Washington Department of Corrections' ("Defendants") motion for 17 leave to argue defense of qualified immunity (Dkt. 138). 18 On November 6, 2014, Defendants filed the instant motion requesting leave to file 19 a dispositive motion on the issue of qualified immunity. *Id.* The motion for leave is 20 necessary because the dispositive motion deadline has passed and Defendants failed to 21 raise the issue in their dispositive motion. *Id.* On November 17, 2014, Plaintiff Michael 22

| 1  | Latourette ("Latourette ") responded arguing that Defendants have failed to show good    |
|----|--|
| 2  | cause for any extension. Dkt. 141. On November 20, 2014, Defendants replied. Dkt.        |
| 3  | 142.   |
| 4  | In this case, there is good cause to allow Defendants to file one additional             |
| 5  | dispositive motion on the defense of qualified immunity. It is in everyone's interest to |
| 6  | either narrow the issues for trial or identify the relevant questions of fact for trial. |
| 7  | Considering the defense of qualified immunity in a dispositive motion would most likely  |
| 8  | achieve this goal. Moreover, this case has a unique procedural posture and there is a    |
| 9  | pending stipulated motion for additional discovery deadlines and a trial date almost six |
| 10 | months from now. As such, Latourette will not be prejudiced if Defendants are allowed    |
| 11 | to file an additional dispositive motion. Therefore, the Court <b>GRANTS</b> Defendants' |
| 12 | motion for leave (Dkt. 138) and Defendants may file a motion for summary judgment on     |
| 13 | the issue of qualified immunity no later than March 26, 2014.                            |
| 14 | IT IS SO ORDERED.  |
| 15 | Dated this 31st day of December, 2014.   |
| 16 | k. AC  |
| 17 | BENJAMIN H. SETTLE   |
| 18 | BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |